



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

could be to it, if the maxim that "the Pope may err in morals but not in faith," be sufficient to show that John X., John XI., and John XII., and many more such Popes, were duly qualified to perform the office of Vicar of Christ irreproachably.

We shall conclude the history of the Popes of the tenth century in our next number.

THE USE OF FORMS OF PRAYER.

We have, in another article, given our readers one specimen of a Roman Catholic controversialist; but as it is our principle always to deal with the best arguments, and the most formidable opponents we can find arrayed against us, we consider it right to introduce them, also, to a higher class of Roman Catholic writers. We are, indeed, ready to acknowledge the marked increase that has taken place of late years in the ability of their controversial publications. Much of this improvement, no doubt, is owing to the accession which their ranks have gained in some recent converts from Protestantism; men (our Maynooth friends will forgive us for saying) of a higher education than has usually adorned the Romish priesthood, and who besides, as deserters, possess the advantage of knowing the exact points against which to direct their fire; or, to speak without any metaphor, of knowing the difficulties most likely to be felt by Protestants, and the arguments most likely to tell with them.

We have before us now a little bundle of controversial tracts, in which we think we do not mistake in saying we observe traces of Protestant education. We select for review that on the "Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary," partly because we have no doubt its statements as to Roman Catholic opinions and practices will convey real information to many Protestant readers on points of which they were ignorant; partly because its line of argument has been reproduced—whether by the same or a different writer—in a late (the November) number of the "Rambler."

We take from the "Rambler"—which is the most concise—the following statement of the difficulty which the writer professes to encounter:—

"In the Rosary, we must first remind our Protestant readers, the 'Hail Mary' is repeated one hundred and fifty times; the 'Our Father,' ten times; and the 'Glory be to the Father,' ten times. Frequently only one-third of the whole is said at once; but the proportion of the three prayers remains the same. This is, at least, the case with that which is commonly called 'the Rosary,' or 'The Rosary of the Blessed Virgin,' for there are others constructed on different plans. This Rosary is, also, the most universally in use of all Catholic popular devotions. It is said repeatedly by every Catholic, from the Pope downwards. Indeed, on an average, it is scarcely too much to state that one-third of the whole is said almost daily by every devout Catholic above the age of childhood.

"Now, all that non-Catholics know of this devotion is, that for every *Pater Noster* and *Gloria Patri* we say ten *Ave Marias*. Is not the deduction inevitable that we think ten (or, rather, five) times as much of the Blessed Virgin as of Almighty God? Or, to be extremely charitable, that we pray five times as often to Mary as to our God and Saviour? So, at least, the world has decided against us.

"But what is the fact? The fact is, that this is not the Rosary which we say, and that no such Rosary exists at all, or was ever heard of in the Catholic Church. The doctrine of the Rosary consists in meditations with the understanding and the heart on the chief events of the life and passion of Jesus Christ, and the great blessings of the Gospel, while, with the lips, we recite all these Hail Marys, Lord's Prayers, and Doxologies."

As we think it possible some of our Protestant readers may be so stupid as not to perceive, on the first reading, the exact point of this defence, we hope to make the matter more clear to them by laying before them the explanation of the use of forms of prayer, which we have learned from Roman Catholic writers. Our readers are aware that differences of opinion prevail among different denominations of Protestants on the question whether extempore prayer is preferable to the use of forms in public worship. They know, also, that the Church of Rome not only agrees with the Church of England in the use of public forms of prayer, but that she carries the use of forms in private devotions to a much greater extent than is common among the members of the reformed Churches. The following extract (from the tract on the Rosary), however, will prove that members of the Church of Rome are not insensible to the force of some objections that may be urged against the use of forms:—

"The defect of this method of devotion is, that in saying words composed by others, we must ask exactly for what they express, and sometimes they will not quite express our own feelings. Sometimes, perhaps, we are ashamed to utter words of absorbing self-abasement, when we are conscious that our own sense of contrition is less deep; or it may be the words before us are all full of joyful love, and we would only be lying at the foot of the cross, crushed and humbled under the intolerable sense of sin. Then, again, our wants are so various, one could not find prayers to meet them all. Sometimes they are very distinct, growing out of the cares of to-day—the little things which belong to our own life, but which may seem unim-

portant to other people—difficulties and temptations which may not occur to other minds, but are very grave and real to us. Sometimes, again, they are not so clear and definite. There are feelings which others cannot understand, and which, perhaps, we do not well understand ourselves. Nothing it may be, but a weariness, and the sense of a great need. It is not that we have this or that to ask for in particular, but we feel weak, and fretful, and unhappy; we desire only to kneel down in God's presence and let him see all our hearts, and then the best-chosen phrases of other men seem stiff and empty. We do not seek for words; or, if any are needed, let them be such as will mould themselves to the fashion of our own unutterable thoughts.

"Surely all must know what I mean, that there is often a consciousness of sin impossible to confess, and a sense of prayer impossible to put into any set form of words. We may try to use our own, chosen at the moment; if so, how difficult it is to select those that are right and good! Sometimes we say the same thing over and over again; sometimes, try as hard as we may, what we say does not express our meaning—it vexes us that our words should be so vague and indistinct, and we puzzle ourselves to find better; and so, in thinking for right expressions, we lose time, and our thoughts get distracted."

Here, then, are some objections, forcibly stated, to the use of forms of prayer—at least in private devotion. How are they to be got over? How are the confessed advantages of forms to be reconciled with the elasticity of extemporeaneous prayer? The secret consists in knowing how to use forms in the right manner. We have already given our readers the key to the enigma, and, therefore, without further mystery, announce to them, that the proper way of employing forms of prayer is to use the forms with the lips while the thoughts are occupied with something else.

Some of our Protestant readers will think this strange, and will, perhaps, find it hard to believe that such advice has been given by Roman Catholics; but if they will reflect for a moment, they will remember, that in the Roman Catholic Church the public service is conducted in Latin—a language not understood by the people—that it is absolutely impossible for them to follow, with their thoughts, the words of the service, and that all that can be expected of them is, that they should occupy their minds, during the time of worship, with some kind of holy and prayerful thoughts, by no means, however, necessarily corresponding to the words uttered by the officiating minister. Nor is this confined to persons ignorant of Latin. A Protestant clergyman, a few years ago, paid a visit to Rome, directing his particular attention to the religious ceremonial, and has published an account of what most struck him. One of the points he noticed, which appeared to him most remarkable was, that the non-officiating clergymen, at the different churches, were almost invariably engaged, during the time of divine worship, with their private books of devotion, that no two of them were occupied in the same study, and that scarcely any one dreamed of following the service actually being performed. Mr. Seymour merely records faithfully what he saw, without giving any theory to account for it, as we are now in a position to do. Our readers, then, must learn, that there are three kinds of attention which may be given to prayer. The first kind is, when you follow the words of the prayer, and attend to their meaning. This is the lowest kind of attention, and almost any one is capable of it. The second kind is, when your heart is filled with the spirit of prayer, without particular attention to the words employed. The third kind is, when you attend to the words, and have the spirit of prayer too. This last kind of attention is, undoubtedly, the best, but is of such a kind that only a few exalted souls are capable of it.

We take the above statement of doctrine from Father Baker's work, "Sancta Sophia," quoted as a standard authority by Mr. Faber, in his book, "All for Jesus," from which we have already made several quotations. We think it better to give our readers Father Baker's own statement of his doctrine—"Now, whereas, in all manner of prayer, there is necessarily required an attention of the mind, without which it is not prayer, we must know that there are several kinds and degrees of attention, all of them good, but yet one more perfect and profitable than another; for—1st, there is an attention, or express reflection on the words and sense of the sentence pronounced by the tongue, or revolved in the mind. Now, this attention being, in the vocal prayer, necessarily to vary and change, according as sentences in the Psalms, &c., do succeed one another, cannot so powerfully and effectually fix the mind or affections on God, because they are presently to be recalled to new considerations or succeeding affections. This is the lowest and most imperfect degree of attention, of which all souls are, in some measure, capable; and the more imperfect they are, the less difficulty there is in yielding it; for souls that have good and established affections to God, can hardly quit a good affection by which they are united to God, and which they find joyful and profitable for them, to exchange it for a new one succeeding in the office; and, if they should, it would be to their prejudice.

"The second degree is that of souls indifferently well practised in internal prayer, who, coming to the reciting of the office, and either bringing with them, or by occasion of such reciting, raising in themselves an efficacious affection to God, do desire, without variation, to continue

it with as profound a recollectiveness as they may, not at all heeding whether it be suitable to the sense of the present passage which they pronounce. This is an attention to God, though not to the words, and is far more beneficial than the former; and, therefore, to oblige any souls to quit such an attention for the former, would be both prejudicial and unreasonable; for, since all vocal prayers, in Scripture and otherwise, were ordained only to this end, to supply and furnish the soul that needs with good matter of affection, by which it may be united to God, a soul that hath already attained to that end, which is union, as long as it lasts ought not to be separated therefrom, and be obliged to seek a new means, till the virtue of the former be spent.

"A third, and most sublime degree of attention to the divine office is, that whereby vocal prayers do become mental—that is, whereby souls, most profoundly, and with a perfect simplicity, united to God, can yet, without any prejudice to such union, attend, also, to the sense and spirit of each passage that they pronounce—yea, thereby find their affection, adhesion, and union increased, and more simplified. This attention comes not till a soul be arrived at perfect contemplation, by means of which the spirit is so habitually united to God, and, besides, the imagination so subdued to the spirit, that it cannot rest upon anything that will distract it. Happy are those souls—of which, God knows, the number is very small—that have attained to this third degree; the which must be ascended by a careful practice of the two former in order, especially of the second degree."

Those of our readers who have mastered the theory of attention here laid down, are now in a position to understand the great advantages of the Rosary, and the wise simplicity of what they may have deemed its vain repetitions. If your thoughts are not to be particularly occupied with the meaning of what you are saying, what possible advantage can there be in giving utterance to long and varied forms of prayer? Is it not far more simple to take some short form—such as the *Pater Noster* or the *Ave Maria*—and repeat it over fifty or a hundred times, or as often as may be necessary, filling your thoughts the while with meditations as holy and as profitable as you are able?

But some of our Protestant friends may here object, and cry out, to what purpose is the use of any words at all. "We have no doubt," says the "Rambler," "that to those who are not Catholics this appears a most extraordinary and preposterous device. They will ask, what can be the possible use of saying one thing, and meaning another? and, in all probability, will flatly deny that we ever do what we pretend, reiterating their conviction that the whole thing is a nonsensical piece of gabbling and muttering—at once unscriptural and irrational. Now, we do not deny, that were a person who is not a Catholic to attempt to say the Rosary in the way we have described, he would be completely baffled in his efforts. When a man has little or none of that inward power by which we realize the objects of our faith, and when he has never been habituated to the peculiar ways of Catholic devotion, he would find the Rosary the most unspiritual and the most tiresome of prayers."

The "Rambler" proceeds to explain the utility of an apparatus or device by which bodily or outward motions may be made subservient to the operations of the mind. We have all heard of children who could not repeat the verses they had learned by heart, unless they were constantly buttoning and unbuttoning their sleeve buttons; or orators who, if not allowed a string to fiddle with, were sure to lose the thread of their discourse; of sailors who cannot go to sleep unless the wind is blowing, while landmen will be awake all night because there is a gust every quarter of an hour.

"Just such is the use of the 'Hail Marys' and other prayers of the Rosary. From childhood a Catholic is accustomed to associate the great mysteries of faith with the low, monotonous murmur from his own lips and those of others of those forms of prayer, and with the mechanical movement of the hands in passing the beads along with the fingers. Even when the custom is not begun in childhood, a short practice confers the necessary unconscious mechanical facility of both lip and finger; and those who, as Protestants, regarded the whole thing as incomprehensible, or laborious, or childish trifling, acquiesce, with delight and gratitude, in the uncaring wisdom of the Church that has sanctioned so admirable and so simple a means for drawing the thoughts away from the glare and gloom of this life and its agitations."

"The string of beads he holds in his hand is simply to assist his memory, and prevent him from losing his place and getting confused in the repetition of the same words so many times. His great object is to keep his mind constantly fixed upon the subject before him; therefore, he is very glad of anything that prevents distraction, and tells him the proper number of prayers has been said without his having to count them, and think whether there is not one more yet to say, which would in a moment take his thoughts off from the presence of God. The touch of the beads, without disturbing him, reminds him of the proper time to change the form of prayer, and when he is to pass from one point of meditation to another. In all this it is the object of the Church to assign some fixed limits to our meditations, though she allows us ample freedom within them. We need discipline in prayer quite as much as in everything else."

It must be confessed, that supposing there is a "proper number" of prayers which it is necessary to say, that the invention of beads for the purpose of counting them with facility is one of the advantages of which cannot be denied.

To complete, however, the defence of the Rosary against the charge of vain repetition, it is necessary to add, that the words employed may receive a new colouring each time—thus, each time that the words "Mary pray for us" are uttered, we may mentally subjoin that we may receive so and so, according to the blessings of which we may at the time feel our need. So that the Rosary, as actually performed, resembles one of those elaborate pieces of music in which the composer, having for his theme some simple strain, ornaments and enriches it with a hundred different variations.

We have thus laid before our readers the best defence that has been given of a practice which Protestants are in the habit of thinking not only absurd but unscriptural. For, certainly, the Church of Rome is right in forbidding her subjects to use their private judgment in the interpretation of the Bible, since she is so unlucky as to be perpetually in, at least apparent, opposition to the Bible, understood as a plain man would interpret it. When, for instance, our Lord directs his followers—"When ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do, for they think they shall be heard for their much speaking"—it does, at first sight, appear that she could not well have gone in more direct opposition to our Lord's commands than by recommending a method of devotion which consists in saying the same words, over and over again, one hundred and fifty times. Even the wiser heathen condemned such repetitions as these. Do you think (says the old heathen in Terence, for example), that the gods are as stupid as yourself, and that they cannot understand a thing unless they are told it a hundred times?

But let us examine the defence that is offered us. It is the same as the apology that the old lady made for the silence of her parrot—"Poor creature, if he does not speak, he thinks the more." As far as the words of the Rosary are concerned, it is acknowledged, that they could not be cleared from the charge of vain repetitions. But, then, it is said, you are not to judge of us by the words; there is enough of variety and of devotion in our thoughts. Let us endeavour, then, without prejudice, to consider the advantages of this kind of mental reservation in our address to God—this method of thinking one thing and saying another.

We by no means deny that some persons of cultivated minds may be able, during the repetition of the Rosary, to carry on in their thoughts such a series of prayers and meditations as the writers we are reviewing describe. But these are just the persons who could, without difficulty (and we should think with far greater profit to themselves), carry on their private devotions in words of their own. But the question is, whether this is the ordinary way in which the Rosary is employed—whether every old woman we see telling her beads does occupy her mind meanwhile in a series of meditations on the principal events of the Gospel history, or whether she rests satisfied that she has offered sufficiently acceptable service to God in the mere repetition of the prayers. In spite of the "Rambler's" insinuations that Roman Catholics have different faculties and powers from Protestants, we shall take the liberty to believe that human nature is pretty much the same in the Church of Rome and our own; and that we are tolerably well able to form a guess as to the degree of devotion which is likely to accompany the use of the Rosary. But we are not left to our own conjecture. The author of the tract we are reviewing tells us "that it is by no means an easy thing to say the Rosary well," and, "that any one who can do so has little more to learn in the science of devotion." This precisely agrees with our own opinion; and, as the "Rambler" tells us, that the Rosary is said daily by millions of Catholics, we may guess in what manner it is said by all, except those few "who have little to learn in the science of devotion."

And now the question arises, what are we to think of the nature of the service performed by those who say the Rosary, but do not say it "well;" who gabble over the prayers, but who do not accompany them with the meditations which are so eloquently described in the tract before us. In the silence of the "Rambler" we must appeal to the authority of the standard Roman Catholic divines, and we shall find that, according to their principles, any person who repeats the words of these prayers, intending thereby to perform an act of divine worship, does, without further condition, perform all that is essential to prayer, and all that is necessary to entitle him to the benefits of it. The account which we are about to give of the attention necessary to prayer, is taken from Cardinal Tolet,[†] and agrees with that laid down by St. Thomas, and by his commentator, Suarez. And if any of our Protestant readers are so prejudiced as to imagine that Roman Catholic doctors teach that attention is not necessary in prayer, let them learn their mistake. There are three kinds of attention, and one of these is absolutely necessary, and that is—attention to the right pronunciation of the words. If any one repeating prayers does not attend so far as to pronounce the right words, or if he hurries so as to pronounce them ill, or if, in reciting with others, a priest gets on so fast as to repeat one verse

of a psalm before those with whom he is reciting have finished the verse preceding—or if any one, in repeating the Rosary, is so inattentive as to skip some of the words, or to say a Gloria when he ought to say an Ave, we do not undertake his defence; no casuist warrants us in saying that by such careless service he can acquire any merit for himself or for others.

The second kind of attention is to understand the meaning of the words, and all are agreed that this is not necessary. "If this were required," says Tolet, "there would be very few, indeed, who could comply with this requirement. All that is necessary is to know that what is repeated is intended for divine praise and worship, and to repeat it with that intention."

The third kind of attention is, to remember during our repeating that we are in the presence of God, and are addressing him. "This kind of attention is of great use," says Tolet, "but is not necessary."

There is another distinction, too, of great importance—that between actual and virtual attention; since it is by no means necessary that we should actually attend to our prayers, provided we pay virtual attention. Virtual attention is when we commence with the intention of being attentive, and though our thoughts wander afterwards, yet we do not let them designedly wander; for instance, if any one, in repeating a Rosary, or if the priest, in reciting his "hours," should write a letter at the same time, or engage in any other work requiring attention, then this would not be considered "virtual attention," since the distraction is deliberate and designed; but if there be no such settled purpose of inattention, no fault is to be found, however little attention he may actually pay. A priest, however, may repeat his "hours" and hear Mass at the same time (thus killing two birds with one stone), since the command to hear Mass does not include any command to attend to the words. Suarez, too, lays it down that, though attention is necessary, yet that the very smallest degree of attention is sufficient in order to constitute real prayer. The tendency, in short, of all this teaching is to represent prayers as producing their effect like charms, *ex opere operato*— "just," says St. Antoninus, "as a precious stone is of as much value in the hands of an unskillful man as of a jeweller." We think, then, we are safe in drawing, from the general principles here laid down, the conclusion, that a person repeating the Rosary without any meditation, but merely with the general notion that he is performing a duty and offering God worship, does all that is necessary to acquire merit by his service. And now we are in a position to see how very unfair is the defence of the Rosary offered by the "Rambler" and his fellow labourer. When Protestants object to the Rosary as consisting of a set of vain repetitions, they are told that they are not to look to the words—that these are meant only as means to excite certain profitable meditations; but, on looking further, we find that these meditations, however useful they may be regarded, are not *essential*, and that the mere saying of the words without understanding them is enough to satisfy the requirements of Roman Catholic divines. Now, any one can see the failure of a defence which turns on an unessential point, which ascribes to a class attributes in reality belonging only to a few individuals of it.

We have heard nothing urged in defence of the Rosary which might not, with equal justice, be urged in behalf of the praying mills of Thibet. There the worshipper is taught to write his prayer on a piece of paper, put it in a mill, and turn it round and round the proper number of times. What is to prevent the Thibetian grinding his mill with, at least, a virtual attention that he is offering some kind of divine worship; and may he not say, perhaps, that he has learned to associate with this mechanical operation, all manner of holy and religious thoughts?

We have, in conclusion, to offer a few remarks upon another point touched on by the "Rambler"—namely, the disproportion between the number of prayers offered to the Virgin and to the Most High—there being ten Aves for one Pater and one Gloria. We shall show that the apologist gains nothing by transferring the question from the words to the thoughts; and that in the subjects selected for meditation there is just as much pre-eminence given to the Virgin as in the words of the prayers. These subjects include, in fact, every incident in the life of the Virgin (some of them, indeed, not found in Scripture at all); and though our Lord is mentioned, it seems to be only because Scripture is obstinately silent as to any part of the history of the Virgin apart from her Son. We give briefly the heads of the subjects, and allow the reader to form his own judgment on them—

"The Fifteen Mysteries of the Holy Rosary."

"The Five Joyful Mysteries."

"1. The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin.
"2. The Visitation of the Blessed Virgin to her cousin Elizabeth.

"3. The birth of our Blessed Lord, at midnight, in the stable at Bethlehem.

"4. The presentation of our Blessed Lord in the Temple by his Virgin Mother.

"5. The finding Jesus among the doctors in the Temple by the Blessed Virgin."

It is easy to see that, in every one of these meditations, the Virgin is made the central figure.

"The Five Sorrowful Mysteries."

"1. The agony of our Lord in the garden.
"2. The scourging of our Lord by the soldiers, who gave Him over 5,000 stripes.

"3. The crowning of our Lord with thorns.

"4. The carrying of the cross, in which our Lord bears, with most amazing patience, the cross which is laid on him for his greater torment and ignominy, meeting His blessed Mother on the way.

"5. The crucifixion of our Lord in the presence of His afflicted mother."

It is to be acknowledged that the Virgin is not mentioned in three of these mysteries.

"The Five Glorious Mysteries."

"1. The Resurrection of our Lord.

"2. His Ascension in the sight of His Blessed Mother and the Apostles.

"3. The descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles as they continued in prayer and supplication with the Blessed Virgin.

"4. The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin.

"5. The coronation of the Blessed Virgin; in which, amid the great jubilee and exultation of the whole Court of Heaven, and to the particular glory of all the saints, she is crowned by her Son with the brightest diadem of glory."

With reference to the first of these glorious mysteries, it is to be borne in mind that Roman Catholic writers, although without any Scripture authority, represent the first appearance of our Lord after His resurrection as being made to the Virgin. It will be seen, then, that in every one of this last set of meditations, too, the Virgin is the figure on which the imagination of the repeater of the Rosary is most likely to dwell.

THE LIFE OF A PRIEST.

(Continued from vol. iii., p. 146.)

In the middle ages the Church of Rome, having no other Church to contend with, gave her own interpretation to the Old and New Scriptures, and to obey the Church was then of primary obligation on the peer as well as on the peasant; nor was it contemplated that a reformation would take place in the Church; and, consequently, it was thought that Transubstantiation, the Mass, Purgatory, and all her other antisciptural doctrines, would be safe from detection behind the impenetrable darkness of ecclesiastical authority.

To aggrandize the Church and increase her revenue has been, at all times, the policy of Rome, to which nothing could contribute more than the Mass, Purgatory, and Indulgences.

It was Gregory the Great who decorated the Mass with deacons, sub-deacons, acolytes, with incense and lights, in order to affect the senses, like any theatrical performance. For the altar above the throne has always been the ardent desire of Rome; and by conferring on the priesthood the superhuman power of creating God and forgiving sins, the Pope was, at the same time, placing himself above the monarchs of the earth; for he who assumed all the power of heaven and of earth could not be less in his own estimation than that of universal monarch. To be the Pontiff Maximus only of the suburban sees would have been nothing—he must also be the head of all the churches that were to be established in both hemispheres.

The next question to which I turned my serious attention was that of Purgatory—a doctrine so much relied on by the Church of Rome—and which I could not find either in the sacred volume or in the records of the early Church; and the conclusion was irresistible that it was introduced into that Church from interested motives, in order to make the Mass of more value, and to increase its demand by its application to souls in that place of punishment. The Mass was introduced as an effective abstergent for the sins of the living and the dead, contrary to the doctrine of the Apostle, who says, "that the blood of Christ his Son cleanseth from all sin." The Church of Rome adduces as a proof of Purgatory the First Epistle of St. Peter iii. 19, 20—"By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison." This prison, it is said, could not be either hell or heaven; therefore, there must be a middle place. But this argument is easily answered by looking at the rest of the passage—

"He preached unto the spirits in prison which sometime were disobedient [incredulous, Donay Bible], when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." The spirits who were disobedient, or incredulous, in the days of Noah were so wicked, that, we are told in the Book of Genesis, ch. vi., "it repented God that he had made man on the earth." "The wickedness of men was great on the earth, and the thought of their heart was bent upon evil at all times." Now, Purgatory is defined by the Church of Rome as a place where venial sins are purged by fire; whereas those spirits who were disobedient in the days of Noah were clearly guilty of mortal sins.

Again, the Church of Rome insists that there are some sins that are forgiven in the next world, according to the doctrine of St. Matthew xii. 32, where he says, "that sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, either in this world or in the world to

* Ohe jam desine uxor gratulando deos obtundere, nisi illos tuo ex ingenio judicas, ut nil credas intelligere nisi idem dictum est certe.

[†] Instruct Sacerd., lib. ii., c. 13. n. 5, 6.